

Dipole Excitation of Dipositronium

Mariusz Puchalski and Andrzej Czarnecki

Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 2G7

The energy interval between the ground and the P-wave excited states of the recently discovered positronium molecule Ps_2 is evaluated, including the relativistic and the leading logarithmic radiative corrections, $E_P - E_S = 0.181\,586\,7(8)$ a.u.. The P-state, decaying usually via annihilation, is found to decay into the ground state by an electric dipole transition 19 percent of the time. Anticipated observation of this transition will provide insight into this exotic system.

Last year's discovery [1] of dipositronium (Ps_2) was welcomed as a herald of a new kind of chemistry. Ps_2 is a bound state consisting of two electrons and two positrons. Its stability against dissociation was predicted in [2], but its observation was very challenging. Ps_2 rapidly annihilates producing photons similar to those from atomic Ps decays. Nevertheless, the evidence of the Ps_2 existence is now compelling.

In the experiment described in [1], an intense pulse of positrons is stopped in porous silica, forming Ps atoms, some of which make their way into the voids of the pores. Ps atoms have two hyperfine states: a short-lived spin-singlet para-positronium (pPs) with a lifetime in vacuum of $\tau_{\text{pPs}} = 0.125$ ns, and a long-lived spin-triplet ortho-positronium (oPs), with $\tau_{\text{oPs}} = 142$ ns. Interactions may shorten the oPs lifetime through two mechanisms: spin exchange quenching (SEQ), in which spins flip converting oPs into the rapidly-decaying pPs; and formation of molecules Ps_2 . In the latter case, as we will discuss below, the probability of each of the electron-positron pairs to be a spin-singlet is one quarter, and the size of the molecule is similar to that of an atom. Thus Ps_2 is short-lived, with the lifetime of about $2\tau_{\text{pPs}}$.

But even if the rapid disappearance of oPs is observed, how can one tell whether this is due to molecule formation rather than SEQ? The key is that the molecule formation needs another body, such as the pore surface, to absorb the released binding energy. As the temperature of silica is increased, the fraction of Ps atoms on the surface decreases, fewer molecules should be formed, and more oPs survive. Exactly such an effect is observed [1]. More recently, evidence of the Ps_2 formation on a metal surface has also been found [3].

As well as proving the existence of the first known system containing more than one positron, this discovery is viewed as an important step towards studies of even more exotic phenomena: larger polyelectrons, Bose condensation of positronia, and eventually a γ -ray laser based on stimulated annihilation.

Before those exciting possibilities are explored, a more detailed study of the newly-discovered Ps_2 is warranted. Like the relatively better-known positronium ion Ps^- [4, 5], the molecule Ps_2 is weakly bound [6, 7]. However, whereas the ion has no excited states stable against dissociation, the molecule has an interesting spectrum of

three: two excited S states and one P [8, 9]. The latter has a sizable branching ratio for an electric dipole transition to the ground state, accessible to middle-ultraviolet laser spectroscopy [10]. This is a great asset since polyelectrons generally decay through annihilation into photons, too much like atomic pPs to reveal the structure of the decaying system. Anticipated observation and precise measurement of this line [11] will confirm the presence of the molecules and test our understanding of their nature.

Measurements of the P-state excitation energy are expected to have a precision of 10 parts per million (ppm) [11], sensitive to relativistic corrections. The relativistic effects have been found recently for the ground state [12] but the P-level energy is only known in the non-relativistic approximation [8].

The challenge of precise theoretical studies of Ps_2 is that it is a relatively complicated four-body system whose components have equal masses. Unlike in molecules built of atoms with hadronic nuclei, no part of Ps_2 can be treated as slowly-varying and the Born-Oppenheimer approximation cannot be applied. Nevertheless, its ground state has already been thoroughly studied with variational and quantum Monte Carlo methods (see [13] for a recent review of earlier work). The P-state is more challenging. Because its wave function has a node, the variational procedure converges slower. Larger expressions for the matrix elements and additional integrals exacerbate the difficulties [14, 15].

To overcome these obstacles, we combined the variational method in a Gaussian basis with algorithms for decomposing the Hamiltonian matrix and for optimizing the wave function. In addition, we sped up the convergence by transforming the operators representing corrections to the energy, using a method proposed by Drachman [16]. As a result we not only match or exceed the accuracy of the best existing evaluation of the relativistic corrections to the ground state, but also extend those results to obtain the leading next-order corrections (QED) and, more important, determine analogous effects for the P-state. We find the energy interval

$$\Delta E \equiv E_P - E_S = 0.181\,586\,7(8) \text{ a.u.}, \quad (1)$$

or 4.941 23(2) eV, corresponding to the wavelength $\lambda = 250.9179(11)$ nm. The branching ratio for the dipole

transition is also determined,

$$\text{BR}(\text{P} \rightarrow \text{S}) \equiv \frac{\Gamma_{\text{dip}}(\text{P} \rightarrow \text{S})}{\Gamma_{\text{annih}}(\text{P}) + \Gamma_{\text{dip}}(\text{P} \rightarrow \text{S})} = 0.191 \quad (2).$$

The positronium's Hamiltonian is

$$H = H_C + \alpha^2 H_{\text{rel}} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^3 \ln \alpha). \quad (3)$$

Its leading term describes the non-relativistic Coulomb system,

$$H_C = \sum_{a=1}^4 \frac{\vec{p}_a^2}{2} + \sum_{a<b} \frac{z_{ab}}{r_{ab}}, \quad (4)$$

where $\vec{p}_a$ and $r_{ab} \equiv |\vec{r}_a - \vec{r}_b|$ are momenta and relative distances of positrons ($a, b = 1, 2$), and electrons (3, 4). z_{ab} equals +1 for a like-charged pair a, b and -1 for opposite charges. As units of length, momentum, and energy, we use $1/\alpha m_e$, αm_e , and $\alpha^2 m_e$, and set $c = \hbar = 1$.

Wave functions and the lowest-order (“nonrelativistic”) values of energy levels are determined by the Coulomb Hamiltonian (4). Higher-order corrections $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2, \alpha^3 \ln \alpha)$ to energies are computed as first-order perturbations with those wave functions.

The Hamiltonian (3) has a rich symmetry [9, 17] that is reflected in the wave functions. In addition to the symmetry with respect to permuting coordinates of electrons, as well as those of positrons, there is also the charge conjugation symmetry. If the system is described by relative coordinates r_{ab} only, the latter is equivalent to the spatial inversion, and described in a given state by its parity π . Thus the wave functions of the ground state with $L^\pi = 0^+$ and of the P-state 1^- are $\psi_i = \mathcal{A}[\chi\phi_i]$, where $\chi = \frac{1}{2}(\uparrow_1\downarrow_2 - \downarrow_1\uparrow_2)(\uparrow_3\downarrow_4 - \downarrow_3\uparrow_4)$ is constructed using electron and positron spinors and the antisymmetrizer is built out of operators permuting pairs of particles, $\mathcal{A} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}(1 + \pi P_{13}P_{24})(1 - P_{12})(1 - P_{34})$. The spatial wave functions ϕ_i are expressed in a Gaussian basis,

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_S &= \sum_{i=1}^N c_i^S \exp \left[- \sum_{a<b} w_{ab}^{iS} r_{ab}^2 \right], \\ \phi_P &= \vec{r}_1 \sum_{i=1}^N c_i^P \exp \left[- \sum_{a<b} w_{ab}^{iP} r_{ab}^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Here $\vec{r}_i$ denotes a particle coordinate with respect to the center of mass. Since $\vec{r}_1 + \vec{r}_2 + \vec{r}_3 + \vec{r}_4 = 0$, in terms of the relative coordinates we have $\vec{r}_1 = \frac{1}{4}(\vec{r}_{12} + \vec{r}_{13} + \vec{r}_{14})$.

The six parameters $w_{ab}^{iS,P}$ in (5) are determined, for each of the N elements of the basis, in an extensive optimization process. QR decomposition [18] and inverse iteration are used to determine energy eigenvalues of H_C . In the i^{th} step of minimizing the energy, the six parameters of the i^{th} basis element are optimized with Powell's method without gradient [18]. The optimization steps

are cycled through the basis elements until convergence is reached. This procedure yields nonrelativistic energies accurate to better than one part per billion, shown in the first line of Table I. The ground state agrees with [12], although our error bar is slightly larger. For the P-state, we improve on the previous best result [8].

To test the numerical procedure, we used the ground-state of lithium, presently the best known four-body system. Its ground-state energy was evaluated using Hylleraas coordinates [19, 20, 21] with a precision of about 10^{-12} . It reliably calibrates both the absolute value and its uncertainty since, thanks to the richer symmetry of Ps_2 , the Gaussian method converges better for it than for Li.

Assured of the quality of the obtained wave function, we proceed to the relativistic corrections. For the two states of interest, the following parts of the Breit-Pauli Hamiltonian [22] contribute,

$$H_{\text{rel}} = H_{\text{MV}} + H_{\text{D}} + H_{\text{OO}} + H_{\text{SS}} + H_{\text{A}}, \quad (6)$$

$$H_{\text{MV}} = -\frac{1}{8} \sum_a \vec{p}_a^4, \quad (7)$$

$$H_{\text{D}} = -\pi \sum_{a<b} z_{ab} \delta^3(r_{ab}), \quad (8)$$

$$H_{\text{OO}} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{a<b} z_{ab} \vec{p}_a^i \left(\frac{\delta^{ij}}{r_{ab}} + \frac{r_{ab}^i r_{ab}^j}{r_{ab}^3} \right) p_b^j, \quad (9)$$

$$H_{\text{SS}} = -\frac{2\pi}{3} \sum_{a<b} z_{ab} \vec{\sigma}_a \cdot \vec{\sigma}_b \delta^3(r_{ab}), \quad (10)$$

$$H_{\text{A}} = \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_{a<b, ab \neq 12, 34} (3 + \vec{\sigma}_a \cdot \vec{\sigma}_b) \delta^3(r_{ab}). \quad (11)$$

Given the spin configuration of Ps_2 , $\vec{\sigma}_a \cdot \vec{\sigma}_b$ can be replaced by zero for an e^+e^- pair, and by -3 for like-charged pairs [12]. Thus, only four operators remain: p^4 , delta-functions for e^+e^- and e^-e^- , and H_{OO} .

A disadvantage of the Gauss basis is its incorrect behavior at short inter-particle distances: it does not reproduce the cusps of the wave function. This slows down the convergence of matrix elements of the delta-function and the kinetic energy (“mass-velocity”) correction p^4 . For example, in lithium with a basis size of 2000, the error is a few units in 10^4 [23]. Even more dangerously, the convergence is so slow that a misleading limit may be deduced. To overcome this difficulty, the operators can be transformed into an equivalent form, whose behavior is less sensitive to the shortest distances. For the delta-function, a prescription was found by Drachman [16]. Neglecting boundary terms, $4\pi\delta^3(r_{ab})\phi_1\phi_2 \rightarrow \frac{2}{r_{ab}}(E - V)\phi_1\phi_2 + \sum_c \frac{(\nabla_c^i \phi_1)(\nabla_c^i \phi_2)}{r_{ab}}$, where $V = \sum_{a<b} \frac{z_{ab}}{r_{ab}}$. For the kinetic energy we use $\sum_a \phi_1 p_a^4 \phi_2 \rightarrow 4(E - V)^2 \phi_1\phi_2 - 2 \sum_{a<b} (\nabla_a^2 \phi_1)(\nabla_b^2 \phi_2)$.

Numerical results for the four basic relativistic operators are shown in Table II. For the ground state we find

agreement with [12] to within 1 ppm for H_{OO} , and three or four digits for the remaining operators. Since these are the operators that we regularized, we believe our results to be more accurate, despite the much smaller size of the basis used (the difference is unimportant since unknown higher-order effects are likely larger). Again, lithium was used as a test. The kinetic correction converges slowest, as usual in many-body calculations [19].

Table I shows corrections to the energy levels. The orbit-orbit and the Darwin terms largely cancel. The result is dominated by the virtual annihilation and, to a smaller degree, by the kinetic term. The annihilation is repulsive and decreases the binding. It is about twice as effective in the ground state as in the P-state so that overall the relativistic effects decrease the S-P interval.

Beyond relativistic corrections, the next largest effect is of the relative size $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^3 \ln \alpha)$, analogous to the Lamb shift in hydrogen. Its physics is richer in positronium [24] because two-photon “recoil” interactions between two light constituents contribute at the same order as the self-interaction corrections. In hydrogen the latter dominate, the recoil effects being suppressed by the electron-to-proton mass ratio. In Ps_2 , one should in principle consider interactions among all pairs of particles. However, contributions of like-charged particles are suppressed by two orders of magnitude, as can be seen by comparing the last two columns of Table II. Thus the coefficient of $\alpha^3 \ln \alpha$ is given with excellent accuracy by expectation values of $\alpha^3 \ln \alpha H_{\log} \equiv -24\alpha^3 \ln \alpha \delta^3(r_{13})$ [25], shown in Table I. We take halves of their values to estimate the error for each level, and add those to obtain the error estimate of the final result, Eq. (1).

The precise value of the e^+e^- overlap given in Table II provides a new prediction of the annihilation rate of Ps_2 in both states,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\text{annih}}(\text{S}) &= 4\pi\alpha^3 \langle \delta^3(r_{13}) \rangle (1 + \text{RC}) \\ &= 1/(0.224\,55(6) \text{ ns}), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$\Gamma_{\text{annih}}(\text{P}) = 1/(0.442\,77(11) \text{ ns}), \quad (13)$$

where the RC denotes the radiative corrections,

$$\text{RC} = \alpha \left(\frac{19\pi}{12} - \frac{17}{\pi} \right) + 2\alpha^2 \ln \frac{1}{\alpha} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2).$$

The error, due to unknown $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$ effects, is estimated as half of the logarithmic correction. The annihilation in state S was previously calculated in [26]. Our result differs slightly, primarily because of the error in the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha)$ correction in that study. The result (12) confirms the expectation that the lifetime of Ps_2 in its ground state is about half of that in pPs. In the P-state, one of the particles overlaps only negligibly with the others, slowing down the annihilation by another factor of two.

For the experimental search of the dipole transition, it is interesting to know how competitive it is relative to

the annihilation. The rate of the dipole transition is

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\text{dip}}(\text{P} \rightarrow \text{S}) &= \frac{4}{3}\alpha^3 (E_{\text{P}} - E_{\text{S}})^3 \left| \langle \text{S} | \vec{d} | \text{P} \rangle \right|^2 \\ &= 1/(1.873 \text{ ns}), \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where $\vec{d} \equiv \vec{r}_1 + \vec{r}_2 - \vec{r}_3 - \vec{r}_4$. The dipole matrix element is determined as a Gaussian integral, $\left| \langle \text{S} | \vec{d} | \text{P} \rangle \right| = 2.040\,942\,265(16)$, and leads to the final result for the branching ratio, Eq. (2). Corrections to this prediction, conservatively estimated as less than one percent, arise from the three-body decay into a photon and two Ps atoms, and from relativistic effects $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$ [27]. The present value exceeds the previous evaluation [10] by about ten percent, a welcome improvement for the experimental search of this transition. The larger value may slightly facilitate the use of the P-S transition intensity to determine the number of the Ps_2 molecules produced.

It is noteworthy that the rate of the dipole transition is similar to twice that in a positronium atom. This confirms the approximate picture of the excited P-state as resembling two weakly interacting positronium atoms, one in its ground state and the other in the P-state [8]. In a molecule consisting of two weakly interacting atoms, the P-S dipole matrix element is, because of coherence, $\sqrt{2}$ times larger than in an isolated atom. This approximation predicts $|\langle \vec{d} \rangle| = \frac{512}{243} = 2.1$. Similarly, in molecular hydrogen one finds [28] $|\langle \vec{d} \rangle| = \frac{256}{243} = 1.05$, in the limit of weak interaction between the two atoms.

Fortunately, the 2P-1S energy interval does differ sufficiently between atomic and molecular positronia for its measurement to unambiguously confirm the existence of Ps_2 . The main difference arises already in the non-relativistic energy values. In the molecule, one Ps atom may be interpreted as a dielectric medium that weakens the electric field in the other one, thus decreasing all energy intervals. Relativistic effects, primarily the annihilation, slightly add to that decrease. The dipole matrix element is also decreased below the asymptotic value of $\sqrt{2}$ times that in a free atom, weakening the transition rate below half of the atomic rate.

On the technical side, this study reveals the somewhat unexpected potential of the correlated Gaussian basis. The fast optimization method described here leads to comparable or better results than previously published, even with a much smaller basis. A drawback of Gaussians is their incorrect asymptotic behavior, both at short and at long distances. This is compensated by the availability of an analytical form of all required matrix elements and by the good numerical behavior of the integrals. Double precision sufficed for the variational parameters.

The Gaussian basis is especially suitable for the positronium molecule since it tracks all inter-particle distances. The high symmetry of Ps_2 improves the convergence of the variational procedure. Parallelizing the code would certainly lead to improvements, and will likely

Source	Ground state	P state
H_C	-0.516 003 790 415 (88)	-0.334 408 317 34(81)
$\alpha^2 H_{MV}$	-0.000 009 152	-0.000 004 780 (1)
$\alpha^2 H_{OO}$	-0.000 013 470	-0.000 007 736
$\alpha^2 H_D$	0.000 014 592	0.000 007 458
$\alpha^2 H_{SS}$	0.000 000 419	0.000 000 097
$\alpha^2 H_A$	0.000 022 202	0.000 011 259
$\alpha^2 H_{rel}$	0.000 014 591	0.000 006 298(1)
$\alpha^3 \ln \alpha H_{log}$	0.000 001 01(50)	0.000 000 51(25)
Total	-0.515 988 2(5)	-0.334 401 5(3)
[12]	-0.515 989 199 656	

TABLE I: Corrections to the energy levels of Ps_2 .

be necessary for the determination of further QED corrections. For the present and foreseeable measurement goals, the theoretical description of the dipole transition energy and its probability presented here is sufficient. Its experimental test will complement the newest chapter in chemistry with one in spectroscopy.

We are indebted to Allen Mills, Jr., Krzysztof Pachucki, Alexander Penin, and Mikhail Voloshin for very helpful discussions. We thank Alexander Brown and Lutosław Wolniewicz for advice on the molecular hydrogen literature, and Paul McGrath for improving the manuscript. This research was supported by Science and Engineering Research Canada.

-
- [1] D. B. Cassidy and A. P. Mills, Jr., *Nature* **449**, 195 (2007).
[2] E. A. Hylleraas and A. Ore, *Phys. Rev.* **71**, 493 (1947).
[3] D. B. Cassidy, S. H. M. Deng, and J. A. P. Mills, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 062511 (2007).

- [4] F. Fleischer *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 063401 (2006).
[5] A. P. Mills, Jr., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **46**, 717 (1981).
[6] M. A. Lee, P. Vashishta, and R. K. Kalia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **51**, 2422 (1983).
[7] Y. K. Ho, *J. Phys. B* **16**, 1503 (1983).
[8] K. Varga, J. Usukura, and Y. Suzuki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1876 (1998).
[9] D. B. Kinghorn and R. D. Poshusta, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 3671 (1993).
[10] J. Usukura, K. Varga, and Y. Suzuki, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 1918 (1998).
[11] A. P. Mills, Jr., 2007, private communication.
[12] S. Bubin, M. Stanke, D. Kędziera, and L. Adamowicz, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 062504 (2007).
[13] M. Emami-Razavi, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 042104 (2008).
[14] F. E. Harris and H. J. Monkhorst, *Int. J. Quant. Chem.* **106**, 54 (2006).
[15] K. Pachucki and J. Komasa, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 022513 (2004).
[16] R. J. Drachman, *J. Phys. B* **14**, 2733 (1981).
[17] D. M. Schrader, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 043401 (2004).
[18] W. H. Press, S. A. Teukolsky, W. T. Vetterling, and B. P. Flannery, *Numerical Recipes*, 2 ed. (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1992).
[19] M. Puchalski and K. Pachucki, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 022503 (2006).
[20] K. Pachucki, M. Puchalski, and E. Remiddi, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 032502 (2004).
[21] K. Pachucki and M. Puchalski, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 032514 (2005).
[22] V. B. Berestetsky, E. M. Lifshitz, and L. P. Pitaevsky, *Quantum Electrodynamics* (Pergamon, Oxford, 1982).
[23] K. Pachucki, W. Cencek, and J. Komasa, *J. Chem. Phys.* **122**, 184101 (2005).
[24] T. Fulton and P. C. Martin, *Phys. Rev.* **95**, 811 (1954).
[25] A. Pineda and J. Soto, *Phys. Rev.* **D59**, 016005 (1999).
[26] D. H. Bailey and A. M. Frolov, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 014501 (2005).
[27] G. W. F. Drake, *Phys. Rev. A* **5**, 1979 (1972).
[28] L. Wolniewicz and G. Staszewska, *J. Mol. Spec.* **220**, 4551 (2003).

Basis size	$\langle \sum_a \vec{p}_a^4 \rangle$	$\left\langle \sum z_{ab} p_a^i \left(\frac{\delta^{ij}}{r_{ab}} + \frac{r_{ab}^i r_{ab}^j}{r_{ab}^3} \right) p_b^j \right\rangle$	$10^2 \langle \delta^3(r_{13}) \rangle$	$10^4 \langle \delta^3(r_{12}) \rangle$
Ground state				
2200	1.374 923(45)	0.505 892 400(27)	2.211 851 17(14)	6.256 827 3(42)
1600 [10]			2.211 51	6.259
6000 [12]	1.374 696 3	0.505 892 40	2.211 775 9	6.257 950 5
State P				
2200	0.718 150(86)	0.290 557 920(46)	1.121 723 38(31)	1.453 512 7(82)
1600 [10]			1.120 91	1.459 1

TABLE II: Expectation values of the basic relativistic operators, compared with previous studies, where available.